

REMARKS

The Examiner rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Since claim 21 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is moot.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 10-22, insofar as claim 21 can be understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as allegedly being anticipated by Yeh et al. (US Patent 6,489,682). Since claims 1-4 and 10-22 have been canceled, the rejection of claims 1-4 and 10-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) is moot.

The Examiner objected to claims 5-9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants have so rewritten claim 5 in independent form, including all of the limitations of claim 1 from which claim 5 depends. In order to improve clarification of claim 5, Applicants have changed the language of the claim 1 that has been incorporated into claim 5 as follows:

"An integrated circuit package, comprising: for holding an integrated circuit die; and connecting a set of circuit bond pads on the die connected to a set of package bond pads disposed on a first surface of the package, the package bond pads being arranged in a set of package bond pad modules such that at least one pair of individual package bond pads is disposed with a package bond pad module overlap in an overlap area along a transverse axis extending substantially perpendicular to the die, a first package bond pad of said pair being connected to a first via positioned inward of said overlap area and a second package bond pad of said pair being connected to a second via positioned outward of said overlap area, all of said first package bond pad, said first via, said second package bond pad and said second via being disposed within one of said package bond pad modules and forming a via submodule, each of said package bond pad modules having a package module pitch along a longitudinal axis parallel to a side of said integrated circuit die"

10/634,414

5

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0457.

Date: 03/18/2005

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850

Jack P. Friedman
Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688